

LONG RANGE PLANNING

**TO:** Plan Review Steering Committee  
**FROM:** Long Range Planning Staff  
**DATE:** May 16, 2002  
**SUBJECT:** Summary Notes from the GMA Steering Committee meeting of  
May 15, 2002 (Meeting #27)

**Attendance:**

Steering Committee Members:

Dean Dossett	City of Camas Mayor
John Idsinga	City of Battle Ground Council Member
Mary Kufeldt-Kufeldt-Antle	City of Camas Council Member
Lou Peterson	Washougal City Council
Jim Robertson	Mayor of Yacolt
Betty Sue Morris	Clark County Board of Commissioners
Judie Stanton	Clark County Board of Commissioners (Chair)
Mike Hefflin	City of Ridgefield Council Member

Public:

Eric Beck	Clark Public Utilities
Kris Bohme	Self
Pat Campbell	Candidate for State Rep. for District #17
Ken Hadley	Self
Michael Holmes	Self
Patrick Holmes	Lane Powell spears Lubersky
James Howsley	Lane Powell spears Lubersky
Don Wastler	Self

Staff:

Rob Anderson	La Center Planning Commission
Bill Barron	Clark County Administrator
Joanne Boyes	City of Washougal Planning
Derek Chisholm	Clark County Long Range Planning
Eric Eisemann	City of La Center and City of Ridgefield
Lianne Forney	Clark County Public Outreach & Information Director
Bob Higbie	Clark County Long Range Planning
Patrick Lee	Clark County Long Range Planning Manager

Rich Lowry  
Glenn Olson  
Rod Orlando  
Carol Parker  
Paul Scarpelli  
Kelly Sills  
Marty Snell  
Bryan Snodgrass  
Josh Warner

Clark County Prosecuting Attorney's Office  
Clark County Office of Budget and Information Systems  
City of Yacolt – EES Consulting  
City of Battle Ground Planning  
Clark County Auditor's Office  
Clark County Board of County Commissioners  
City of Camas Planner  
City of Vancouver Interim Planning Supervisor  
Clark County Community Development

## **1. Introductions**

Commissioner Stanton called the meeting to order at 4:10. Attendees introduced themselves.

## **2. Review March 20, 2002 meeting notes**

Accepted as distributed.

## **3. Revenue sharing roundtable presentation**

Commissioner Morris began the presentation. The issue is that there is a competition among jurisdictions for revenues. A group has been meeting since August to discuss the issue and there has been a lot of learning among the jurisdictions. A spreadsheet was distributed to the members and was walked through by Morris. There is a handout that looks at examples from around the country.

Glenn Olson and Paul Scarpelli presented information about the Industrial Lands Development Analysis (handout). Olson started the presentation by suggesting that revenue sharing is a challenge. Profitability in the public sector is seen in a different way than it is in the private sector. A model has been looked at to buy a site and begin the development process and then sell it to a private entity. There have been three sites looked at with in the county. The sites are one each in Camas, Battle Ground and eastern Vancouver at 88<sup>th</sup> and Andresen. Scarpelli emphasized the assumptions that are used for the analysis. The specifics are outlined in the handout. With the leasing option the jurisdiction will need to be able to carry the financing costs over a period of time.

Kufeldt-Antle asked about a private developer taking the lead. Scarpelli responded that that might be a next step. The idea is to sell early and they do not want to be a landlord. Kufeldt-Antle asked about state and federal funding or grants. Olson responded that there might be some state money for a project like this and it would probably be in the form of low interest loans. They have not looked at any federal money options.

Stanton asked if there are many examples of revenue sharing around. Sills responded that there are programs, but it is not common. Dossett added that most are private ventures. Sills added that it is hard to characterize the intent.

Stanton asked where it goes from here. Morris said that still needs to be worked out and the money is hard to come by. Maybe a B & O tax or excise tax that is specific for economic development. Getting all of the jurisdictions to agree is challenging because there is usually a loser in the short-term. Deciding how to divvy up the revenues is difficult. C-Tran will benefit from the scenarios. Sills said that they will be meeting again in June.

#### **4. Letter from County to Cities on deadlines for receipt of information**

Lee asked the staff representative to say how they are doing on meeting the deadline for information submittals. The info is due by May 24<sup>th</sup> and that will give some form to the UGBs. Snodgrass said Vancouver's schedule is to have recommendations in by the deadline. Snell said Camas will have a memo to the county by the end of next week. Eisemann for Ridgefield will be close to May 24<sup>th</sup>, but may be late. La Center will be the same. Parker from Battle Ground said they will be past the deadline by a couple of weeks. Boyes from Washougal said they do not plan to extend the boundary. Orlando from Yacolt said they are not proposing to expand the UGB.

#### **5. Summary of recent public meetings on the Environmental Impact Statement and Capital Facilities Plan**

Lee said the info from the public meetings has not been collated yet because they had outstanding attendance at the meetings. It is hard to tell yet if there is a consensus of opinion on how people would like growth to proceed. Issues will be categorized and that will feed into the EIS process and scenarios.

#### **6. Schedule and Tasks for Release of Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)**

There is a handout of the interrelated processes that Lee went through. Alternatives will be impacted by public input and conversations with the commissioners. The transportation system process is complex and will take some time. They are coordinating with RTC on this issue. Staff is hoping for a DEIS by November 2002.

#### **7. TAC update**

##### **a. Model Urban Sewer Code status**

Higbie discussed the sewer ordinance update. The TAC was tasked about a year ago to reduce new septic usage in the urban area and how to convert existing septic systems to sewer. The handout deals with new systems and not conversion. Conversion is challenging because of different providers and their various funding mechanisms. The TAC created a subcommittee to work on this issue. The proposal is in the handout. Staff

from the various jurisdictions are familiar with the proposal. The county is ready to move forward on the proposal and encourages other jurisdictions to do the same.

Kufeldt-Antle asked about how the model code relates to the activity with the Health District (HD). Lowry responded that they both respond to the same concerns from a HD concern. The county has been looking at the land use issues and the HD has been redoing their regulations as well. The financing issue may be the challenge. If the HD moves too quickly the momentum may go away for the other jurisdictions to change the other ordinances.

Kufeldt-Antle said the issue is the funding. She is concerned that this needs to be looked into further. Lee responded that there are two issues. New development has been looked at. The other issue is the retrofitting of existing systems. The funding can be burdensome to individuals. Lowry said the issues are not totally separate. There are some areas in the UGB without sewer. Morris asks if there are any exceptions for land divisions. Lowry responds that there are not exceptions, unless there is no effluent produced by the proposed use. The constitutional issues are takings and the exceptions look to be fine. If prohibiting septic and the access to public sewer is remote in the future than it might be a problem. Lowry says the language is fine, but as applied it might be an issue if there are areas that will never have sewer. Higbie said that providers have been asked to state if there are areas that will not be served. Lowry discussed the exceptions in the current code. This language goes further than the Health District which is dealing with lot size variances for septic systems. Morris says we need a map for areas that will be precluded from development because of this new ordinance.

Kufeldt-Antle says the issue is a concern about septic in the urban areas. There was surprise that there are smaller lots with septic or public sewer is available but one property owner stands in the way. Lowry wants to bring the issue forward in a comprehensive package. Lowry said that this is a public process. Stanton asks Kufeldt-Antle if they should all be tied together. Kufeldt-Antle responds yes. She thinks the cost for conversion can be financed and put onto the property tax bill and go with the land. She wants to see scenarios and what grants might be available. More info on the financing is needed. Need more data on un-sewerable areas. Also need to know the timing and financing for existing septic systems to convert to sewer. The Health District might get a Clean Water Act grant to do some research.

## **8. Next meeting date and time**

June 26, 2002. The location to be determined.

## **9. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.

h:\long range planning\projects\cpt 99.003 five year update\cpt 99-003 - steering committee\minutes - steering\steering committee - May 15 2001(#27).doc